DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 396 378 EA 027 601

TITLE	Framework for Change: A Continuum for School Restructuring.
INSTITUTION	Texas Education Agency, Austin.
PUB DATE	Mar 95
NOTE	37p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Texas Education Agency, Publications Distribution Office, 1701 North Congress Avenue, Austin, TX 78701-1494 (Stock No. RE5-203-02).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; Community Involvement; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Mission Statements; Partnerships in Education; Performance; School Community Relationship; *School Restructuring; Staff Development; State Standards
IDENTIFIERS	*Texas

ABSTRACT

The Partnership Schools Initiative (PSI) originated among Texas schools in 1992 as a network to create an educational system for achieving excellence and equity for all students. Participants in the network developed a matrix to be used by schools embarking on restructuring efforts, which identifies what leaders of successful schools can do to create a context for change. This document contains the framework developed by the Partnership Schools facilitators, who incorporated feedback from educators, teachers, and Education Service Center directors. The framework is based on the experiences of the Partnership Schools members as they worked through a systemic change process. Each part of the framework addresses one of the six PSI objectives. Each objective and its essential components are described through a continuum of stages of change. The objectives are to: (1) involve all levels of the campus community in the decision-making process; (2) provide comprehensive staff development that addresses campus needs; (3) develop partnerships that support campus plans for improvement; (4) identify and remove barriers that hinder student performance; (5) design and implement a plan to improve the performance of all students; and (6) share the experiences and results of campus initiatives. A list of participating schools is included. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 396 378

FRAMEWORK FOR CHANGE

A Continuum for School Restructuring

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. Kemp
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Partnership Schools Initiative
Texas Education Agency

EA 027 601

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

(State Board for Vocational Education)

JACK CHRISTIE, D.C., Houston
Chairman of the State Board of Education
District 6

MONTE HASIE, Lubbock
Vice Chairman of the State Board of Education
District 15

MARY HELEN BERLANGA, Corpus Christi
Secretary of the State Board of Education
District 2

Board Members

ALMA A. ALLEN, Ed.D., Houston
District 4

DONNA BALLARD, The Woodlands
District 8

CAROLYN HONEA CRAWFORD, Ph.D., Beaumont
District 7

WILL D. DAVIS, Austin
District 10

GERALDINE MILLER, Dallas
District 12

RENE NUÑEZ, El Paso
District 1

ROBERT H. OFFUTT, San Antonio
District 5

DIANE PATRICK, Arlington
District 11

ROSIE COLLINS SORRELLS, Ed.D., Dallas
District 13

ESTEBAN SOSA, San Antonio
District 3

RANDY STEVENSON, Tyler
District 9

RICHARD WATSON, Gorman
District 14

MIKE MOSES, Ed.D.
Commissioner of Education
(Executive Officer of the State Board of Education)

Committees of the State Board of Education

FINANCE

WILL D. DAVIS, Co-Chairman
MONTE HASIE, Co-Chairman
JACK CHRISTIE, D.C.
CAROLYN HONEA CRAWFORD, Ph.D.
ESTEBAN SOSA

STUDENTS

DONNA BALLARD, Chairman
MARY HELEN BERLANGA
GERALDINE MILLER
ROBERT H. OFFUTT
RANDY STEVENSON

PERSONNEL

DIANE PATRICK, Chairman
ALMA A. ALLEN, Ed.D.
RENE NUÑEZ
ROSIE COLLINS SORRELLS, Ed.D.
RICHARD WATSON

PERMANENT SCHOOL FUND

ESTEBAN SOSA, Chairman
MARY HELEN BERLANGA
WILL D. DAVIS
MONTE HASIE
GERALDINE MILLER
RENE NUÑEZ

LONG-RANGE PLANNING

ROBERT H. OFFUTT, Chairman
ALMA A. ALLEN, Ed.D.
DONNA BALLARD
JACK CHRISTIE, D.C.
CAROLYN HONEA CRAWFORD, Ph.D.
DIANE PATRICK
ROSIE COLLINS SORRELLS, Ed.D.
RANDY STEVENSON
RICHARD WATSON

FRAMEWORK FOR CHANGE

A CONTINUUM FOR SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING

March 1995

DEVELOPED BY THE

PARTNERSHIP SCHOOLS INITIATIVE

Texas Education Agency

In Partnership With

Texas Education Service Centers

This document is not copyrighted; any or all sections may be duplicated. The Texas Education Agency would appreciate credit for the material used and a copy of the reprint.

For more information or additional copies, contact:

Texas Education Agency
Publications Distribution Office
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

Refer to Publication Number RE5-203-02

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Appreciation is extended to the numerous individuals who have contributed to the development of the *Framework for Change: A Continuum for School Restructuring*. This document was developed through the partnership of the Education Service Centers, the Texas Education Agency, and the Partnership Schools Initiative (PSI) campuses and districts. Appreciation is also extended to former Commissioner of Education Lionel R. Meno for his vision embodied in the Partnership Schools.

Very sincere thanks go to all facilitators for their hard work and contributions in furthering the development of the *Framework for Change* and to all the stakeholders in the field who gave feedback and input.

The following individuals were responsible for the development of this document: Partnership Schools Initiative Facilitators Gloria Crum, Education Service Center (ESC) Region I; Stuart Isdale, ESC Region II; Melba Nuñez, ESC Region III; Mary Ann Currie, ESC Region IV; Monica Mahfouz, ESC Region V; James Delbert, ESC Region VI; Brent Taylor, ESC Region VII; Marsha McCoy, ESC Region VIII; Marilyn Keck, ESC Region IX; Kathie van Teeckelenburgh, ESC Region X; Ann Hoover, ESC Region XI; Linda Holbrook, ESC Region XII; Nora Nielsen, ESC Region XIII; Ann McLennan, ESC Region XIV; Barbara Brown, ESC Region XV; Ricki Chapman, ESC Region XVI; Maria Mora de Gamble, ESC Region XVII; Sharon Welch, ESC Region XVIII; Joseph Parker, ESC Region XIX; Ed Vara, ESC Region XX; Gloria Amescua, Director of Programs, and Laura Price Cobb, Senior Director, Partnership Schools Initiative, Texas Education Agency.

Additional acknowledgments are offered to the contributions of the following people who assisted the schools in their restructuring: Former Partnership Schools Facilitators Shelley Range, ESC Region II; Betty Musch, ESC Region XI; Emily O'Connor, ESC Region VIII; Carolyn Dungan, ESC Region VIII; and Lydia Ozuna, ESC Region IV, who also led the facilitators and directors in the initial process of developing the Framework.

Special thanks go to Gloria Nava, Administrative Technician, Partnership Schools Initiative, Texas Education Agency, and Della Mae Mertens, Secretary, Education Service Center, Region XX, for their invaluable assistance.

The feedback and ideas contributed by Education Service Center Executive Directors, and Partnership Schools Initiative superintendents, central office personnel, principals, and teachers also greatly enhanced the document.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	3
Rationale	5
Mission, Goal, Objectives	7
Description of Terms; Description of Stages	9
Objective 1 To involve all levels of the campus community in the decision-making process	11
Objective 2 To provide comprehensive staff development that addresses campus needs	15
Objective 3 To develop partnerships that support campus plans for improvement	19
Objective 4 To identify and remove barriers which hinder student performance	23
Objective 5 To design and implement a plan to improve the performance of all students	27
Objective 6 To share the experiences and results of campus initiatives	31
Possible Uses for Framework	35
Schools by Region	37

"Every Person is a Change Agent."

Michael Fullan
Change Forces, 1993

FOREWORD

The schools in the Partnership Schools Initiative, named in 1992, accepted a challenge to create an educational system designed to achieve excellence and equity for all students. Along with this opportunity for growth and development, they accepted the responsibility to examine who they were, where they were going and why. In this process, they have faced a complex journey of change.

The change process is one that is difficult to characterize. The participants have found that it is exhausting and thrilling. They have also found that it is nonlinear—that there are times to push for risk-taking and times to support, times for searching and times for plunging in, times for action and times for reflection. They have learned that there is forward motion, backsliding and the status quo, but also that change is a continuous cycle or spiral.

Through risk-taking, creativity, and collaboration, the Partnership Schools engaged in restructuring. What has been learned through this process evolved into a desire and a need to develop a tool that schools could use for self-assessment, reflection, dialogue, motivation, and direction.

The beginning and planning for the development of what is now known as the *Framework for Change: A Continuum for School Restructuring* began in the summer of 1994. The Partnership Schools facilitators and the TEA directors met in the fall to begin the development of an innovation configuration matrix which could be used by the Partnership Schools and by other schools embarking on restructuring. The initial discussions centered around what leaders of successful schools do and about creating a context for change. Two models were starting points for the development: the Innovation Configuration Matrix developed by the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, available through the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL), as well as SEDL's process model, and A Continuum of Systemic Change developed by InSites, A Support Network for Educational Change.

Throughout the fall, this group worked on identifying and defining the configuration of components, stages, and descriptors through discussions and writing of design teams and the entire group. They reached consensus about all aspects of the *Framework* including that its design be narrative and developmental.

At this point, the facilitators sought input from the field from principals, teachers, superintendents, and Education Service Center Directors. Their comments and suggestions were reviewed and incorporated early in 1995. Thus, the *Framework for Change: A Continuum for School Restructuring* is a document which incorporates the best thinking from those involved in the Partnership Schools and in the process of facilitating and supporting change at the campus, district, regional and state levels.

Without the commitment of the many people involved in this initiative, the progress that the Partnership Schools have made would have been difficult. These campuses accepted the challenge of changing the old system and meeting the needs of all students to work toward excellence and equity. Their efforts and progress in preparing their students for the future are to be commended.

RATIONALE

The Partnership Schools Initiative was created to be a catalyst for systemic change. Campuses were empowered to meet the unique needs of their students. They were given the freedom and flexibility to restructure with the goal of improving student achievement and closing the performance gap among students.

The Partnership Schools along with their school educational support structures are in the third year of restructuring their schools. Representing the diversity of the State of Texas, the Partnership Schools are at various stages in the process of change. Their restructuring is providing crucial learning about the process of change in different situations. What has been learned from the experiences of the Partnership Schools as they work through a systemic change process has led to the creation of the *Framework for Change: A Continuum for School Restructuring*.

The *Framework for Change* is a developmental tool that can be used by schools that are restructuring to benchmark their progress through stages of change. It is a document that captures the essence of the growth taking place in the Partnership Schools, which reflects the changes taking place in any school that is undertaking systemic change. The stages of growth indicate a continuum where the majority of the school community may be at any given time. This document focuses on systemic change rather than just program implementation.

The intent of the document is that it be used as a developmental tool that charts progress. It is specific so that those who are using it will have a clear idea of who is responsible, who might be involved, and for what specific actions. Since it is specific, it is not intended to simply be handed out to users. The document needs the human element to guide the campus community through it, whether it is being used to stimulate dialogue, for planning, or various other purposes.

Each part of the *Framework* addresses one of the six PSI objectives. Each objective and its essential components are described throughout a continuum of stages of change. A school should be able to recognize if a majority of its staff, students, parents, and community exhibit a preponderance of the descriptors. The descriptors are not inclusive of all aspects of each objective, but they describe various indicators that are probably present. A campus may be, and most likely will be, at different stages depending upon the component and objective.

An additional concept is that after being maintained, the new system becomes the old. The *Framework for Change* indicates a process that is cyclical in nature, encouraging futuristic thinking. The stages remain the same but with different descriptors. Campuses that have restructured and evolved will have learned how to transition more quickly through the stages. Having learned the process of change, schools can incorporate many components at a higher level.

The *Framework for Change: A Continuum for School Restructuring* has many possible uses. It is hoped that it is not only the Partnership Schools that will benefit from its development, but that the Framework enhances the sharing of the experiences of the Partnership Schools to the benefit of schools throughout Texas and beyond.

THE PARTNERSHIP SCHOOLS INITIATIVE

MISSION STATEMENT

The Partnership Schools Initiative, as a catalyst for systemic change, provides support, freedom and empowerment to campuses in meeting their unique needs and involves all stakeholders in facilitating academic excellence and equity.

GOAL

The goal of the Partnership Schools Initiative is to demonstrate that schools can overcome complex challenges to improve student achievement and close performance gaps.

OBJECTIVES

- To involve all levels of the campus community in the decision-making process.
- To provide comprehensive staff development that addresses campus needs.
- To develop partnerships that support campus plans for improvement.
- To identify and remove barriers which hinder student performance.
- To design and implement a plan to improve the performance of all students.
- To share the experiences and results of campus initiatives.

DESCRIPTION OF TERMS

Objectives - The objectives are derived from the Partnership Schools Initiative mission and goal. They support restructuring to improve student achievement.

Stages - (across the top) These indicate where a school might be in the process of restructuring. These titles suggest what might be occurring in a period of progress, growth or development.

Components - (down the sides) These can be thought of as critical attributes or essential considerations for each objective.

Descriptors - These are the descriptions or variations which list some conditions that may be experienced by the school, segments of the school, or school community.

DESCRIPTION OF STAGES
(Key Words and Phrases)

Maintenance of Old System - the known, the comfort zone, "That's the way we've always done it."

Awareness - learning, brought to my attention

Exploring - trying out, going out to see what's happening; looking for options available

Transitioning - doing, starting to use, adopting new, commitment to identified areas

Emerging - connecting, full implementation, beginning of internalization

Predominance of New System - institutionalization, system established

OBJECTIVE 1

To involve all levels of the campus community in the decision-making process

OBJECTIVE 1 *To involve all levels of the campus community in the decision-making proce*

	Maintenance of Old System	Awareness	Exploring
Identification of campus community members in the decision-making process	• Principal only makes decisions.	• Principal asks a select group of teachers to give input into the decisions.	• Principal and select group of teachers begin to explore potential community members to be involved in decisions. • Select group of parents is perceived by principal and teachers as influential and willing to act as a voice for the principal and teachers. • Selected parents are asked to join committee and participate in making decisions. • Committee solicits parental membership and representatives from the community "at large."
Definition of the roles of the campus community members in the decision-making process	• No conscious decision is made to define roles.	• Compliance with policy for instituting Site-Based Decision-Making (SBDM) committees is achieved. • Strict interpretation of state policy is used in discussing the SBDM committee. Freedom to go beyond the literal interpretation of guidelines is denied by the principal.	• A conscious decision is made to define the roles of the committee and the parameters within which the committee functions i.e., advise, recommend, act.
Provision of a structure for the decision-making process	• No structure is defined. • Decisions are made utilizing haphazard methods, frequently on an "ad hoc" basis.	• Group of teachers is convened at times to make some decisions. • Group provides input for principal to make decisions. • Principal recognizes that some parental committees may need to be asked to give input regarding some decisions.	• A decision-making group is formed according to SBDM policy. • SBDM committee recognizes the need to gather data, information, ideas, and opinions from a variety of sources. • SBDM committee is required to have principal's approval prior to gathering any information or data. • SBDM committee uses data to verify preselected or preconceived needs of the campus. • SBDM committee recognizes the need for training in all facets of the decision-making process.
Implementation of procedures to involve all levels of the campus community in the decision-making process	• No procedure is defined for the campus community to be involved in making decisions, and the need may not be recognized. • Parents are informed in writing of meetings. • Information distributed to families is in English even though some families may not read in English. • Campus meetings are ill-attended. There is a lack of representation from the total school populations. • Campus personnel have the mind-set that "we are the experts and we will tell you what to do."	• Campus personnel recognize that part of the population is being ignored. • Campus personnel recognize that a small select group of parents and teachers run the meetings and control the content. • Campus personnel recognize that the school does not have all the answers for every problem that affects its clientele.	• Campus personnel recognize the need to communicate with parents in more than one language and medium regarding school/community events.
Development of procedures to determine the effectiveness of the campus community in the decision-making process	• Meetings are called by the principal or select committee members on an ad hoc basis. • No notification of meetings is given to the community-at-large. • Minimal advance notification of meetings is given to parents.	• Meetings are scheduled by principal and select committee members on a regular basis but too far apart to be effective. • Information about meeting is given to parents and teachers by word of mouth or in a newsletter. • Some input is solicited from select group of people regarding agenda items.	• Campus secretary provides new families with PTA / PTO information and urges them to call respective people for details. • Principal and select committee members discuss other organizations that should be invited to meetings. • Principal and select committee members discuss alternative ways of informing community about meetings. • Principal and select committee members ask for informal feedback regarding meetings and agenda.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Transitioning	Emerging New System	Predominance of the New System
• Selected students are invited to "sit-in" on meetings with no expectation from campus personnel for students to participate. • Specific parents that represent various ethnic groups and economic levels are asked to assist with decisions; however, they are expected to willingly agree. • Select committee recognizes that divergent thinking is needed to address the school's problems.	• Committee includes community members that represent business/industry, higher education, social/service organizations, and feeder campuses. • Committee expects that the new members will serve in an advisory capacity to the school. • Committee expects the student representative to represent the student body.	• Students select representative(s) to participate on the committee. • Equal representation of socioeconomic and ethnic groups is required. • Committee members are expected to fully participate in making decisions. • Focus of the committee is for the entire community and not only the "good" of the school. • Time is allocated by all members of the community to participate fully in the decision-making process.
• Volunteers from the community "at large" are asked to join the committee. SBDM committee is formed and begins making decisions.	• SBDM committee recognizes the need to obtain information and recommendations from multiple committees. • SBDM committee recommends that other groups be formed to assist with decisions. • Additional committees and/or task force groups are formed to assist with decisions.	• SBDM committee defines its roles and functions. • SBDM members are empowered to make consensus-based decisions.
• SBDM committee recognizes the need to correlate the various task forces or subcommittees according to function and purpose. • SBDM committee initiates the collection of data or information. Principal's approval is not required. • Data is collected and given to various groups to make recommendations to the SBDM committee. • SBDM committee uses recommendations, however, only "majority rule" decisions are made by the group. • SBDM committee recognizes the need for training in consensus-building strategies to be given to the group.	• SBDM committee and task force groups are empowered to gather, analyze and prioritize data, plus make recommendations for decisions. • SBDM committee uses recommendations to make decisions. (The majority acknowledges the rights of the minority with some consideration given to the needs and requests of the minority.) • Equity of group membership is becoming important to the composition of the SBDM committee.	• The campus community is empowered to make decisions by its involvement in the SBDM committee or one of the other subcommittees or task groups. • The campus community is provided training in decision-making and consensus-building. • The collaborative process for making decisions is in place and functioning. • Appropriate decisions are consensus driven.
• Campus begins to use technology and other communication devices to involve/inform its clientele. • Campus committees recognize the need to make parents and community members feel valued. • Alternative and creative methods are implemented to reach out and bring the community into the school i.e., family picnics, festivals, mentor parents for new families, multilingual presentations at school functions. • All of the campus community members know the procedures followed by the school in obtaining and disseminating information.	• SBDM committee, task groups, and other campus committees begin to plan activities and functions that utilize a variety of innovative methods and communication devices to involve/inform the entire school population.	• All campus community functions are planned by the various committees utilizing alternative and creative methods to involve all aspects of the population.
• Campus provides a list of new families to the PTA/PTO. • New families are contacted, informed and invited to school meetings. • Community members are notified that the school is having a meeting. • Evaluative information is requested from participants; however, no action is taken with the material. • Groups formed for the purpose of decision-making begin to represent grade levels, departments, content areas, etc.	• Campus and PTA/PTO work together to provide methods for new families to be contacted, informed, invited and taken to the meetings. • Community members attend meetings with no expectation from anyone to participate. • Evaluative information is requested with results acted upon and incorporated into future agenda.	• Campus committees and task force groups meet on a regular basis. • Meetings are publicized in advance with notification using innovative communicative devices and multilingual approaches to reflect the population. • Input for the agenda is actively solicited prior to meetings. • Meeting agenda is distributed in advance. • Committees and task force groups continue to function when the campus or group leadership changes. • Meetings include representatives from all identified campus community decision-makers. • Campus community members use reflection to self-correct at various points in the meeting. • Evaluative information is used for designing structure and process of future meetings.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OBJECTIVE 2

To provide comprehensive staff development that addresses campus needs

OBJECTIVE 2 *To provide comprehensive staff development that addresses campus nee*

	Maintenance of Old System	Awareness	Exploring
Process for identification of staff development needs	• Needs are determined by campus or district administrator. • Needs are mandated. • No vision is evident. • Disaggregated student data are not used.	• Most needs are determined by administration with limited input from staff. • Needs are predominately mandated. • Need for developing a vision becomes apparent. • Awareness of importance of using disaggregated data to identify needs begins.	• SBDM team is involved to some degree in determining needs. • Campus determines some non-mandated needs. • Relationship between vision and need is explored.
Campus planning for staff development	• No staff is involved in planning staff development. • No visionary leadership is evident. • Staff members do not collaborate.	• Limited staff is involved in planning. • Principal increases awareness of leadership role and relates it to the vision. • Principal and limited staff begin planning and becoming aware of available staff development. • Staff development topics are decided by only a few staff members.	• SBDM team is beginning to be involved in planning for staff development. • Principal begins to empower staff. • Principal still has major control. • Principal is beginning to consider the role of vision in decision-making. • School committee begins to discuss and choose some staff development topics.
Implementing staff development	• Staff development is scheduled for short-term. • Topics are disconnected. • Current fads are emphasized. • Student needs are not addressed in staff development. • Staff development lacks follow-up. • New teacher orientation is not apparent.	• Problems of short-term scheduling are recognized. • Staff members begin to discuss relevant topics. • Staff members are becoming aware of needs but are still looking for quick fixes. • Awareness of student data increases. • Need for more time on topics is recognized. • Follow-up is still not provided. • Need for staff development orientation for teachers new to campus becomes apparent.	• Some long-range scheduling is developed. • Collaborative decisions are made on some relevant topics. • Some connections between needs and topic selection are recognized. • Staff learns to disaggregate data. • Enough time to address some topics is scheduled. • Follow-up is minimal. • Means of addressing staff development for teachers new to campus are explored.
Stakeholder and resource support	• Little money or time is provided. • There is a lack of support from central office and board of trustees. • There is a lack of campus community support. • Community does not understand nor support present staff development.	• Need for money and time is recognized. • Principal begins to have discussions about change with central office. • Awareness sessions are conducted for staff about change. • Little community support is evident with complaints about students being out of school.	• Funds and time are made available for pilot staff development days. • Results of staff development planning are shared with central office and board of trustees. • More faculty sessions are conducted on value of change and collaboration.
Time frame	• Discreet, small pieces are not tied to any needs assessment. • There is no recognition of time involved in making change last. • All staff development is based on short-term needs. • There is no support from central office, board of trustees.	• Leadership begins to see the connection between time and lasting change. • Leadership is becoming aware of connecting needs assessment and sufficient time to plan. • Administration still demands change in unrealistic time frame.	• Leadership recognizes need for staff development days. • Staff begins to prioritize necessary changes so sufficient time is allotted. • Administration is listening to change ideas and time needed to implement.
Results of staff development	• Staff development produces no measurable evidence of use. • Staff expresses dissatisfaction with present inservice schedule. • There is no real improvement in student performance.	• Topics are specific in nature but do not correlate with school plans. • There is no significant change in student performance. • Staff development is beginning to focus on vision.	• Occasional staff development topics are directed toward campus plan on improving student achievement. • Staff is still not committed to staff development; community is not generally supportive. • Students' performance may increase for certain subgroups but not whole student body. • Staff is experimenting with implementing portions of training received in staff development.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Transitioning	Emerging New System	Predominance of the New System
• SBDM team and related groups determine major needs. • Few needs are mandated with more local needs determined. • Vision and mission are developed as training is received in data analysis.	• All stakeholders are involved in determining needs. • Needs are determined largely by student data. • Stakeholders look at sources of data beyond state assessments and indicators such as AEIS and prioritize needs based on data.	• Needs are determined collaboratively by all stakeholders. • Needs are based on student performance. • Study of needs has moved from study of overall student population data to data on specific populations.
• Leadership provides meeting time for planning and study groups. • Vision is present. • Decisions are aligned with vision. • School committee, or special subcommittee is beginning to choose more staff development topics.	• All stakeholders are involved in campus planning with apparent focus on established vision. • Staff development begins to support vision. • Staff development is almost totally the result of school decisions based upon improving student performance.	• All stakeholders plan campus staff development. • Staff development supports campus vision.
• More staff development is scheduled in advance. • Involvement of stakeholders in selection of topics increases. • More compatibility exists between needs and topics. • Time and topics are more closely related. • Value of follow-up is recognized. • Outside presenters are aware of needs prior to staff development day. • Selected staff members receive training to become in-house trainers for current and new staff members.	• High priority topics are scheduled for staff development. • Topics are collaboratively selected by stakeholders. • Needs and topics are compatible. • Identification of student needs are based on disaggregated data. • Time and topics are related. • Follow-up is routinely provided. • Value of staff development is evidenced by preplanning for facilitator, materials, and food.	• Research-based topics address needs in campus plan. • Collaboratively selected topics are aligned to address student needs. • Staff development is based on specific needs. • Staff development is driven by student needs. • Appropriate time is provided for topics. • Continuous follow-up provides feedback for improvement. • Stakeholders look for staff development to extend institutionalized training.
• Information sessions for parents, business, and community are arranged. • Staff development program is expanded. • Funding is available for staff development. • Staff understands change process.	• Staff development funding is established as a regular budget item. • Staff development philosophy is part of the campus culture. • Community is involved in and accepting of staff development issues.	• Sufficient financial support is committed by all stakeholders. • Appropriate time is provided to conduct quality staff development. • District recognizes and supports need for quality staff development. • Campus community understands and supports staff development. • Stakeholders continue to be involved in ongoing staff development as well as maintaining accomplished goals.
• Principal/staff members request needed staff development days. • Principal/staff members recognize that systemic change will take extended time. • Administration offers support for pilot change and allows time to complete.	• Staff development days provide sufficient time for identified staff development needs. • Staff members begin to identify benchmarks to recognize progress. • Administration actively supports campus request for time and understands time frame needed.	• All those involved understand and commit the time needed to make systemic change. • Benchmarks are established to recognize progress. • Long-range and short-range staff development topics are chosen based on needs of the campus plan. • Administrators promote systemic change by allowing for realistic time frame.
• Staff development begins to include follow-up and evaluation of impact on student achievement. • Staff members generally support staff development and put into practice what is learned. The community is beginning to support time for staff development. • Student performance is increasing for most students. • Staff members spend time planning how to utilize training in their classrooms. • Staff members adjust practices based on experiences after training.	• Use of staff development training is observed in most aspects of school. • Student performance has improved for almost all students and student groups. • Assessment reveals evidence of staff development being used in the classroom.	• The practices derived from staff development have become institutionalized. • Level of use is clearly evident and measurable. • Increased student performance is clearly evident. • Performance gaps among all populations are narrowing.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OBJECTIVE 3

To develop partnerships that support campus plans for improvement

Objective 3 *To develop partnerships that support campus plans for improvement*

	Maintenance of Old System	Awareness	Exploring
Identification of partners (partners include all stakeholders i.e. students, parents, teachers, administrators, community and business members, etc.)	• No partners are identified. • Traditional partners (PTA/PTO, room mother, booster club) are identified. • Self-selected volunteers are involved.	• Principal assumes sole responsibility for identifying partners. • Presentations are made to civic/business groups to develop an awareness of program.	• Teachers and SBDM council identify partners. • Process is developed for identifying partners. • Presentations are made to civic/business groups to develop an understanding of the program and to ask for input of ways they can assist.
Levels of involvement	• People outside school are not involved. • Partnerships are one-shot supplemental activities.	• The need for partnerships to be extended over time and to become more integral to school mission is discussed in meetings.	• School leaders begin conversations with potential partners on core educational issues. • Partners serve as tutors.
Roles	• Clerical (bulletin boards, duplicating, etc.) roles are identified. • Supplier (coupons, financial support, etc.) roles are active. • PTA/PTO officers are in place.	• Selected parents serve on Site-Based Decision Making (SBDM) council. • Campus staff members become aware of the multiple roles partners can play in the educational program.	• Campus study groups research different roles for partners.
System of communication	• There is little communication with those outside the building. • Letters are sent home by way of students. • One-way communication is delivered in one language. • PTA/PTO meetings are the major source of communication.	• Newsletters are sent periodically. • Occasional newspaper articles are written on school activities. • Flyers are distributed. • Voice mail messages (announcements, one-way, etc.) are available.	• Business and community partners are invited to campuses (open house, information fair, and other organized activities). • Meeting is held with identified partners. • Newspaper articles are written to share curriculum and instruction. • Newspaper articles are written to seek potential new partners. • Cable TV is utilized to communicate to larger community. • Two-way communication (e.g., homework hotlines, parent hotlines) is established.
Results	• No link is evident between partnerships and campus improvement plan. • Activities comply with parent involvement mandate. • No information is formally gathered on effectiveness of partners.	• Records are kept of volunteer hours by campus office staff.	• New ways for interacting with partners are developed (set up a business advisory committee to develop ways to assist schools).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Framework for Change: A Continuum for School Restructuring
Developed by the Partnership Schools Initiative
Texas Education Agency • March 1995

21

Transitioning	Emerging New System	Predominance of the New System
• A process is utilized for identifying partners. • Needs of partners are assessed to find interests and areas for campus improvement. • Partners are surveyed to determine areas of interest and expertise that support campus plans.	• Mutually beneficial partnerships are developed that support the campus plan. • Campus staff regularly shares initiatives with partners.	• Ongoing process is guided by SBDM council to maintain and continue mutually beneficial partnerships and to identify new partnerships.
• Mutually beneficial partnerships are established. • Partners are an integral part of the daily operation of the campus. • Partners and staff meet on a regular basis to facilitate the process of involvement.	• Multiple partners support vision and school learning through collaborative efforts in curriculum and instructional activities as well as presentations (board meetings and conferences).	• Partners actively participate in campus decision-making. • New partnership designs emerge. • Partnerships among schools and other districts evolve. • Students work together on projects (e.g., through interactive video).
• Partners serve as advisors to teachers and administrators. • Community members serve on SBDM council.	• Partners advocate for campus in community. • Partners serve on multiple campus committees.	• Reciprocal training occurs between campus and partners. • Mentoring and internship agreements with businesses are developed. • University partnerships (research, evaluation, training of future teachers, etc.) are developed.
• Staff acknowledges and supports a communication component in the campus plan. • Communication committees are formed.	• Regular scheduled meetings with multiple partners for updates on school initiatives are conducted. • Communication committees are functioning.	• Communication is initiated by partners and/or school. • Communication is two-way process. • Partners may identify other partners. • Partnerships serve as communication and information channels. • Communication with partners is facilitated via computer bulletin boards and other technology.
• Time is allowed for planning with partners. • Partners and staff are trying new approaches for working together.	• A wide variety of stakeholders are involved in implementation of campus plan.	• Ongoing effort is maintained for partners and staff for continuous improvement of the campus plan.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OBJECTIVE 4

To identify and remove barriers which hinder student performance

23

Objective 4 *To identify and remove barriers which hinder student performance*

	Maintenance of Old System	Awareness	Exploring
Process of identifying barriers which hinder student performance	• Available data are not utilized to identify barriers. • No barriers are identified. • Emphasis is placed on remediation programs which do not target specific barriers.	• The need to use data in identifying barriers is recognized. • Discrepancy between expected outcomes and actual outcomes is recognized. • Unfocused remediation programs are recognized as ineffective.	• Principal and some staff explore different types of data to collect to identify barriers (AEIS, instruction, grouping, curriculum, staff development, climate, Correlates of Effective Schools, etc.). • There is a search for reasons to understand why there is a discrepancy. • Other options (instructional practices) that directly address barriers are surveyed.
Process of removing barriers which hinder student performance	• No process is in place for removing barriers caused by local rules/regulations for compliance (inflexible system). • Difficulties occur in accessing waiver process. • Staff development is general and not targeted to identified barriers.	• The need to have a process in place to remove barriers is acknowledged. • Campus administration becomes aware that a waiver process can be accessed. • Campus administration recognizes that specific staff development is needed to improve skills to overcome identified barriers.	• The different processes by which barriers could be removed are explored. • The state's system of rules/regulations for barriers to student performance is examined. • Available trainings that target identified barriers are explored.
Participants in the process of identifying and removing barriers which hinder student performance	• No one identifies barriers. • Barriers are identified through a system of compliance from the state.	• Central office staff makes campus administration aware of the need to identify barriers. • There is recognition that meeting compliance issues does not necessarily remove barriers because the process does not involve local stakeholders or focus on student achievement.	• Campus administrators and small groups (counselor, department heads, grade levels chairs, leaders) participate in the process of trying to identify barriers. • New roles and responsibilities are given to district/campus staff to determine barriers from the state.
Evaluating the process of identifying and removing barriers which hinder student performance	• No process is in place for evaluation.	• The need for evaluation is recognized.	• Different evaluation processes are explored.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Transitioning	Emerging New System	Predominance of the New System
• Campus administrators and small groups manipulate/disaggregate data to identify barriers (needs). • A process for answering why is developed. • New options that directly address barriers are compared and contrasted.	• Data are utilized to identify barriers. • A process for identifying barriers is implemented. • Appropriate instructional practices that address barriers are implemented.	• Data are continually utilized to identify barriers. • The process for identifying barriers is institutionalized. • Appropriate instructional practices and learning environment are in place to meet the needs of all students.
• Processes to begin to remove barriers are developed. • Waivers to remove barriers established by governmental entities are developed. • Staff development plan is based on identified needs to overcome barriers.	• Processes to remove barriers are implemented. • The waiver process to remove barriers is implemented. • Training begins that targets identified needs to overcome barriers.	• The process to remove barriers is institutionalized. • The waiver process for removing barriers is institutionalized. • Staff development becomes a part of the process for removing barriers.
• Campus administrators and small groups recognize the need to involve all stakeholders in identifying barriers. • Administrators, teachers, students, parents, and community determine barriers by student achievement results rather than compliance from the state.	• All stakeholders are represented in the process of identifying barriers. • Local district/campus is empowered to identify real barriers and meet the needs of all students.	• All stakeholders participate in the process of identifying barriers. • Local site-based decision making teams identify barriers which hinder student performance and prevent meeting the needs of all students.
• A process for evaluating the identification of barriers is developed.	• The process for evaluating the identification of barriers is implemented.	• The process for evaluating the identification of barriers is institutionalized.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OBJECTIVE 5

To design and implement a plan to improve the performance of all students

Objective 5 *To design and implement a plan to improve the performance of all stude*

	Maintenance of Old System	Awareness	Exploring
Alignment	• The campus plan is not connected to a vision. • Isolated, individual faculty efforts occur throughout the campus.	• The need for coordination of efforts in addressing improved student performance is recognized.	• Dialog groups are initiated. • Open communication about student performance exists.
Needs assessment	• There is no needs assessment. • Needs are determined in a top-down fashion (sole source).	• The gap that exists between student performance and the desired outcome becomes apparent.	Needs are assessed through • stakeholders survey. • disaggregation of data. • examination of additional sources of information.
Collaboration	• Top-down or limited collaboration determines campus plan content.	• The potential power of collaboration (synergy) is recognized.	• Groups study student performance issues. • Team building efforts are initiated. • Parents and community are minimally involved.
Writing the plan	• Writing is done by one or a few persons. • Responsibility of stakeholders is unclear. • Plan is general and vague.	• The need to involve all stakeholders in the planning process is recognized. • The need for the campus plan to address the improved performance of all students is acknowledged.	• A campus needs assessment is conducted. • Goals and objectives are explored.
Plan in action	• No connection exits between what is going on at the campus and the campus plan. • Plan is shelved.	• Individuals see the plan as a separate part of their job. • Staff development is provided to assist in implementation of campus plan.	• Dialog about the linkages between the campus plan and student performance occurs. • Various stakeholders experiment with implementation of the plan.
Assessment	• One summative evaluation is only source. • No assessment of movement toward increased student achievement is conducted.	• The need to evaluate, monitor and adjust the plan as appropriate is recognized.	• Procedures and processes for assessment are examined. • Benchmarks with associated time lines are identified. • Desired outcome behaviors are identified.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Framework for Change A Continuum for School Restructuring
Developed by the Partnership Schools Initiative
Texas Education Agency • March 1995

Transitioning	Emerging New System	Predominance of the New System
• Stakeholders establish common beliefs about student performance. • Vision is articulated and supported by all stakeholders.	• Written plan reflects belief and vision for student performance.	• All stakeholders share a common vision that results in improved student performance.
• Prioritized needs are based on a common understanding of what the data is saying about the needs of all students.	• Stakeholders act on prioritized needs.	• Campus engages in ongoing needs assessment from multiple sources that yield information leading to increased student performance.
• Stakeholder input is invited and accepted. • Stakeholders are active, contributing team members.	• Plans are collaboratively developed. • Stakeholders are empowered. • Plan reinforces the value of diversity.	• A collaborative, integrated approach is utilized to improve student achievement.
• After identifying the roles, responsibilities, time lines and resources, the campus plan is drafted.	• Clearly articulated plan is presented to stakeholders.	• The plan drives instructional decisions, staff development, and school organization in a way that effectively improves the performance of all students.
• Stakeholders take ownership of the plan.	• Stakeholders integrate the plan into what they do. • Organizational and instructional practices reflect plan implementation.	• Teachers use the plan as a resource to guide decisions which impact student achievement. • Stakeholders' behavior reflects a clear understanding of the plan. • Students are able to tell what they are doing and why.
• A process to monitor, evaluate and adjust plan is established. • Measurement of performance is related to identified outcomes. • Appropriate modifications are made.	• Assessment of plan is a part of the continuous improvement loop. • Assessment occurs at various levels, i.e., individual teachers, grade level, department, campus. • Student performance improves.	• Student performance drives frequent and ongoing reevaluations of plan in action.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OBJECTIVE 6

To share the experiences and results of campus initiatives

Objective 6 — *To share the experiences and results of campus initiatives*

	Maintenance of Old System	Awareness	Exploring
Plan/preparation	• No plan for sharing is articulated.	• Minimal plan or preparation for sharing is developed. • Few strategies for sharing are evidenced in campus plan.	• Guidelines for sharing are written. • District supports resources, release time, etc. • Action research on effective sharing practices is initiated.
Types of sharing	• Principal/staff react only to requests for sharing. • Little or no sharing on the campus with teachers and/or parents is evident. • No incoming site visits are allowed. • Principal submits administrative reports only.	• Informal and infrequent sharing occurs on an individual level on the campus and otherwise. • Required sharing in periodic reports is completed. • No incoming site visits are allowed.	• Planned sharing within district and school community is limited. • Attendance and interaction of staff at structured networking activities increase. • Incoming site visits to observe key personnel are limited.
Involvement	• Principal and teachers are minimally involved in sharing.	• Sharing is done by campus leader only. • Teachers begin sharing promising practices with each other on campus.	• Sharing by key campus individuals (team leaders, department chairs, program directors, etc.) is conducted within and outside the district. • Few teachers are sharing classroom instructional practices with parents (conference, newsletters, etc.).
Substance of content	• Classroom experiences are shared by individual teachers with parents and peers. • Campus activities are shared by principal in required reports (district meetings, board of trustees meetings, etc.).	• Campus activities and program descriptions (successes) are reported in limited situations (PTA/PTO, district meetings, board of trustees meetings).	• Sharing campus experiences (instructional and programmatic) which impact student achievement begins. • Key individuals start clarifying what information needs to be shared.
Response to sharing	• Little or no response and/or involvement with the campus is apparent.	• Inquiries/questions related to activities and programs are answered.	• Requests for incoming site visits to explore options are being received. • Feedback (questions, suggestions, etc.) by parents and community members is received.

Framework for Change: A Continuum for School Restructuring
Developed by the Partnership Schools Initiative
Texas Education Agency • March 1995

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Transitioning	Emerging New System	Predominance of the New System
• Short-term annual plan begins to focus on sharing opportunities • District support through resources, release time, etc increases • Staff members are coached in presentation skills • Teams meet to develop ways to share • Action research continues	• Process/procedures are in place to promote sharing • Stakeholders begin to implement long-range and short-term plans for sharing • Stakeholders begin to identify innovative ways to secure additional resources to support sharing • Teachers receive training to become trainers/presenters	• Commitment to sharing is evidenced by the implementation of a collaborative, long-range communication plan which includes: purpose/outcomes, strategies, time lines, persons responsible, resource allocations, training, and assessment
• Types of communication delivered locally and regionally, such as presentations and written communications, expand • Structured sharing/networking activities expand • Incoming site visitors are welcomed to observe campus programs and share materials	• Stakeholders use a broad variety of communication techniques at local, regional, and state levels, such as presentations, written communications, and interactive networking • Openness to incoming site visits with planned interaction and supplemental materials is publicized	• Stakeholders actively seek opportunities to exchange information • Stakeholders use a wide array of multimedia communications (newsletters, brochures, workshops, etc.) at local regional, state, national and international levels • Human resources are shared between districts in a mentoring/ training capacity • Sharing is tailored to the needs of the audience (awareness, exploring, etc.) • An openness to incoming site visits with preparation, pre/post interaction, supplemental materials, and follow-up networking is publicized
• Expanded sharing within and outside the district includes teachers, parents, central office personnel, and key business partners	• Campus staff, district staff, board members, students, and community members demonstrate ownership by participating in sharing opportunities	• The total educational support structure (students, teachers, parents, district, community members, business leaders, etc.) participates and has the expertise and empowerment to advocate and communicate the experiences and results of campus initiatives
• Staff members share data-driven results and reveal the pitfalls and successes of the initiatives	• Some of the critical issues of the restructuring process and data-based results are shared	• School community exhibits a willingness and commitment to share all aspects of the restructuring process: critical issues, planning/implementation /assessment, and data-based results
• Involvement by parents in the educational process increases • Number of site visits increases • Number of requests to share processes and documents by other schools increases	• Staff development is occasionally shared with parents, community members, and other schools • Requests are received for campus individuals to be on regional/state committees • Stakeholders are solicited by organizations/individuals to make presentations • Requests are received for submission of articles for publication at local/regional levels • School networks begin to develop	• Evidence/documentation exists that other campuses have implemented their version of the shared initiatives and/or processes • Collaborative networking is established with other schools (staff development, visitations, curriculum development, etc.) • Requests are received for submission of articles for publication or participation in other media (video, broadcast, etc.) at all levels (local, regional, state, and national)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

POSSIBLE USES FOR FRAMEWORK

Stimulate thinking

Chart the big picture

Planning tool

Self assessment

Dialogue

Coaching (to help move school; know what to ask)

Establish benchmarks

Focus

Unifying tool

Inclusion in an article

Research and data

Common vocabulary

Consistency in project

Provide direction

Sharing tool

Establish credibility

Communicate with others outside campus

Cognitive outreach — connection between PSI and other programs

Model for other campuses

Education Service Centers could use with other schools

SCHOOLS BY REGION

ESC Region I

El Jardín Elementary School
6911 Boca Chica
Brownsville 78521
512/831-6000

Pharr-San Juan-Alamo High School
1229 South I Rd.
San Juan 78577
210/783-2200

Jefferson Elementary School
904 South 12th
Edinburg 78539
210/383-1342

Dr. J. G. Cigarroa Middle School
2600 Palo Blanco
Laredo 78042
210/722-8175

Los Fresnos High School
P.O. Box 309
Los Fresnos 78566
210/233-3300

ESC Region II

Alice High School
No. 1 Coyote Trail
Alice 78332
512/664-0126

Ortiz Intermediate School
208 East Ave. H
Robstown 78380
512/387-9402

Driscoll Elementary School
P.O. Box 238
Driscoll 78351
512/387-9072

Hamlin Middle School
3900 Hamlin Dr.
Corpus Christi 78411
512/878-1438

ESC Region III

Pierce Primary School
2400 4th Street
Bay City 77414
409/245-4864

Smith Elementary School
2901 Erwin
Victoria 77901
512/578-2837

Stroman High School
P.O. Box 1759
Victoria 77902
512/578-2711

ESC Region IV

Sherman Elementary School
1909 McKee St.
Houston 77009
713/227-3933

Thompson Intermediate School
11309 Sagedowne Ln.
Houston 77089
713/481-4953

Michael Kennedy Elementary School
10200 Huntington Place Dr.
Houston 77099
713/983-8338

Parker Elementary School
6802 Jones Dr.
Galveston 77551
409/744-5257

J.P. Dabbs Elementary School
302 Lambuth
Deer Park 77536
713/930-4901

Northbrook Middle School
3030 Rosefield
Houston 77080
713/462-7294 ext 3002

Welch Middle School
11544 S. Gessner
Houston 77071
713/995-1100

Oak Forest Elementary School
1401 West 43rd St.
Houston 77018
713/686-2911

ESC Region V

MacArthur Elementary School
350 Woodrow
Beaumont 77705
409/832-6003

Woodville Middle School
505 North Charlton
Woodville 75979
409/283-7109

Kountze High School
P.O. Box 460
Kountze 77625
409/246-3474

ESC Region VI

Scott Johnson Elementary School
1310 School Rd.
Huntsville 77340
409/295-2502

Rockdale Elementary School
P.O. Box 632
Rockdale 76567
512/446-2501

Corrigan-Camden High School
South Home St. #01060
Corrigan 75939
409/398-2543

ESC Region VII

David Crockett Elementary School
700 Jasper Drive
Marshall 75670
903/938-1400

Nettie Marshall Elementary School
422 West Cox
Nacogdoches 75961
409/569-5062

Winnsboro High School
409 Newsome Rd.
Winnsboro 75494
903/342-3641

ESC Region VIII

Pittsburg Primary School
303 Broach St.
Pittsburg 75686
903/856-6482

Pittsburg Intermediate School
303 Broach St.
Pittsburg 75686
903/856-6472

Pittsburg Middle School
303 Broach St.
Pittsburg 75686
903/856-6432

Pittsburg High School
303 Broach St.
Pittsburg 75686
903/856-3646

Crockett Middle School
655 S. Collegiate Dr.
Paris 75460
903/737-7450

DeKalb Elementary School
152 Southwest Maple St.
DeKalb 75559
903/667-2328

Mount Pleasant High School
P.O. Box 1117
Mount Pleasant 75456
903/572-1891

ESC Region IX

Chillicothe High School
P.O. Box 550
Chillicothe 79225
817/852-5322

Olney Elementary School
P.O. Box 548
Olney 76374
817/564-5608

Nocona High School
816 Clay St.
Nocona 76255
817/825-3264

Nocona Middle School
816 Clay St.
Nocona 76255
817/825-3264

ESC Region X

Vivian Field Middle School
13551 Dennis Ln.
Farmers Branch 75234
214/247-7197

Elsie Robertson Lancaster High School
822 W. Pleasant Run Rd.
Lancaster 75146
214/227-2418

Richardson West Junior High School
1309 Holly Dr.
Richardson 75080
214/470-5350

Barron Elementary School
3300 Avenue P
Plano 75074
214/423-7330

Woodrow Wilson High School
100 S. Glasgow
Dallas 75214
214/841-5100

Wolfe City High School
P.O. Box L
Wolfe City 75496
903/496-7333

ESC Region XI

Speer Elementary School
811 Fuller
Arlington 76012
817/460-6892

E. Ray Elementary School
7309 Sheridan Rd.
Fort Worth 76134
817/568-3545

South Hills Elementary School
3009 Bilglade Rd.
Fort Worth 76133
817/922-6695

Joshua Middle School
520 Stadium Dr.
Joshua 76058
817/645-5381

Shirley Hall Middle School
902 Charles St.
Weatherford 76087
817/598-2822

Joshua High School
P. O. Box 40
Joshua 76058-0040
817/558-3703

ESC Region XII

Sparta Elementary School
P.O. Box 1217
Belton 76513
817/939-0818

Groesbeck Primary School
800 W. Trinity St.
Groesbeck 76642
817/729-3431

Belton Intermediate School
1704 Sparta Rd.
Belton 76513
817/939-0818

H. O. Whitehurst Elementary School
800 W. Trinity St.
Groesbeck 76642
817/729-2888

Enge-Washington Intermediate School
800 W. Trinity St.
Groesbeck 76642
817/729-3435

Groesbeck Middle School
800 W. Trinity St.
Groesbeck 76642
817/729-3435

Groesbeck High School
800 W. Trinity St.
Groesbeck 76642
817/729-5933

ESC Region XIII

Campbell Elementary School
1600 Chicon
Austin 78702
512/472-7561

Harris Elementary School
1711 Wheless Ln.
Austin 78723
512/928-0047

Hutto Elementary School
100 Meger Ln.
Hutto 78634
512/846-2111

Flatonia Elementary School
P.O. Box 189
Flatonia 78941
512/865-2947

Hutto High School
100 Meger Ln.
Hutto 78634
512/846-2111

ESC Region XIV

Paint Creek Elementary and High
Route 2 Box 19
Haskell 79521
817/864-2471

Colorado High School
1500 N. Lone Wolf Blvd.
Colorado City 79512
915/728-3424

Colorado Middle School
1500 N. Lone Wolf Blvd.
Colorado City 79512
915/728-3424

Hutchinson Elementary School
1500 N. Lone Wolf Blvd.
Colorado City 79512
915/728-3424

Kelley Elementary School
1500 N. Lone Wolf Blvd.
Colorado City 79512
915/728-3424

ESC Region XV

East Side Elementary School
1009 Avenue J
Del Rio 78840
210/774-9466

Eldorado Middle School
P.O. Box W
Eldorado 76936
915/853-3028

Holiman Elementary School
1900 Ricks Dr.
San Angelo 76903
915/653-3903

Irion County Elementary School
P.O. Box 469
Mertzon 76941
915/835-3991

ESC Region XVI

Lamar Elementary School
1234 S. Nelson
Pampa 79065
806/669-4880

Shirley Intermediate School
239 Avenue H
Hereford 79045
806/364-0622

Swinburn Elementary School
300 North Dallas
Tulia 79088
806/995-4309

Hart Elementary School
P.O. Box 490
Hart 79043
806/938-2142

Travis Middle School
2815 Martin Rd.
Amarillo 79107
806/381-7200

ESC Region XVII

Ralls Elementary School
P.O. Box A D
Ralls 79357
806/253-2546

Bean Elementary School
3001 Avenue N
Lubbock 79405
806/766-1666

Brownfield Intermediate School
601 Tahoka Rd.
Brownfield 79316
806/637-4997

ESC Region XVIII

Burleson Elementary School
P.O. Box 3912
Odessa 79760
915/362-3101

Hood Junior High School
P.O. Box 3912
Odessa 79760
915/362-2371

Ector Junior High School
P.O. Box 3912
Odessa 79760
915/337-8693

Barstow Elementary
P.O. Box 869
Pecos 79772
915/445-6741

Midland High School
906 W. Illinois
Midland 79701
915/689-1100

ESC Region XIX

MacArthur School
8101 Whitus
El Paso 79925
915/772-1457

Bel Air High School
731 Yarbrough Dr.
El Paso 79915
915/598-3437

Dell City Elementary and High School
P.O. Box 37
Dell City 79837
915/964-2495

Bassett Middle School
4400 Elm St.
El Paso 79930
915/565-9938

Austin High School
3500 Memphis
El Paso 79930
915/562/7611

ESC Region XX

Westwood Terrace Elementary School
7615 Bronco
San Antonio 78227
210/678-2780

Hawthorne Elementary School
115 W. Josephine St.
San Antonio 78212
210/733-1321

Scobee Elementary School
1123 Cedar Park
San Antonio 78249
512/558-3227

Pecan Valley Elementary School
3966 East Southcross
San Antonio 78222
210/333-1230

Fox Technical High School
637 N. Main Ave.
San Antonio 78205
210/226-5103

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

TITLE VI, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964; THE MODIFIED COURT ORDER, CIVIL ACTION 5281, FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT, EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, TYLER DIVISION

Reviews of local education agencies pertaining to compliance with Title VI Civil Rights Act of 1964 and with specific requirements of the Modified Court Order, Civil Action No. 5281, Federal District Court, Eastern District of Texas, Tyler Division are conducted periodically by staff representatives of the Texas Education Agency. These reviews cover at least the following policies and practices:

(1) acceptance policies on student transfers from other school districts;

(2) operation of school bus routes or runs on a nonsegregated basis;

(3) nondiscrimination in extracurricular activities and the use of school facilities;

(4) nondiscriminatory practices in the hiring, assigning, promoting, paying, demoting, reassigning, or dismissing of faculty and staff members who work with children;

(5) enrollment and assignment of students without discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin;

(6) nondiscriminatory practices relating to the use of a student's first language; and

(7) evidence of published procedures for hearing complaints and grievances

In addition to conducting reviews, the Texas Education Agency staff representatives check complaints of discrimination made by a citizen or citizens residing in a school district where it is alleged discriminatory practices have occurred or are occurring.

Where a violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act is found, the findings are reported to the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education.

If there is a direct violation of the Court Order in Civil Action No. 5281 that cannot be cleared through negotiation, the sanctions required by the Court Order are applied.

TITLE VII, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964 AS AMENDED BY THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1972; EXECUTIVE ORDERS 11246 AND 11375; EQUAL PAY ACT OF 1964; TITLE IX, EDUCATION AMENDMENTS; REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973 AS AMENDED; 1974 AMENDMENTS TO THE WAGE-HOUR LAW EXPANDING THE AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967; VIETNAM ERA VETERANS READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1972 AS AMENDED; IMMIGRATION REFORM AND CONTROL ACT OF 1986; AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990; AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1991.

The Texas Education Agency shall comply fully with the nondiscrimination provisions of all federal and state laws, rules, and regulations by assuring that no person shall be excluded from consideration for recruitment, selection, appointment, training, promotion, retention, or any other personnel action, or be denied any benefits or participation in any educational programs or activities which it operates on the grounds of race, religion, color, national origin, sex, disability, age, or veteran status (except where age, sex, or disability constitutes a bona fide occupational qualification necessary to proper and efficient administration). The Texas Education Agency is an Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action employer.

Texas Education Agency
1701 N. Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

RE5-203-02
March 1995

BEST COPY AVAILABLE